

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 YURIY V. VASILCHUCK,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 J. DOERER, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16

No. 1:25-cv-00792 JLT SAB (PC)

ORDER CONSTRUING OBJECTIONS AS A
NOTICE OF VOLUNTARY DISMISSAL
AND DISMISSING ACTION WITHOUT
PREJUDICE

(Doc. 11)

17 On October 6, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations
18 recommending that the action be dismissed for failure to state a cognizable claim for relief. (Doc.
19 11.) Plaintiff timely filed objections on October 20, 2025. (Doc. 12.)

20 According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this Court performed a de novo review of this case
21 and has carefully reviewed the entire matter, including Plaintiff's articulate objections. Therein,
22 after discussing his frustration with the *Bivens* doctrine and articulating several other substantive
23 objections, he indicates that he has "1 year left to serve on his sentence so [he] must concentrate
24 on preparing for release," and states that he has "neither the time, understanding or stomach to
25 proceed like this," so he "withdraw[s] the Complaint." The Court construes this as a request for
26 voluntary dismissal pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1)(A)(i) (permitting a party to dismiss a case
27 before the opposing party has served either a notice or a motion for summary judgment). Thus,
28 the Court **ORDERS**.

- 1 1. This action is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.
- 2 2. The Findings and Recommendations are **TERMINATED AS MOOT**.
- 3 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to **CLOSE THIS CASE**.

4
5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: **October 25, 2025**


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE